

REMARKS

Claims 15-34 have been added. Claims 1, 4, 6, 9, 11, 12, 13 and 14 have been amended. Claims 2, 3, 7, 8 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 4-6 and 9-34 are pending in the Application. The Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed on December 5, 2003. Reconsideration of all outstanding rejections and objections in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 12, 13 and 14 have been amended to correct antecedent basis. In particular, these claims have been amended to recite “displaying [[the]] data of the expanded and converted three-dimensional display object image on said display device.”

Claim 6 has been amended to correct antecedent basis. In particular, claim 6 has been amended to recite “the ratio of the outline trace associated with said skeleton model to data associated with said basic body [[data]]”

Claim 4 has been amended to correct a typographical error. In particular, “superposed” has been replaced with “superimposed”.

Claim 9 has been amended to correct antecedent basis. In particular, claim 9 has been amended to recite “[the] a behavior mode”

Claim 11 has been amended to correct antecedent basis. In particular, claim 11 has been amended to recite “... [[the]] an area ... [[the]] a volume”

Claim 12 has been amended to more clearly state the claimed subject matter. In particular, claim limitations in claim 12 have been amended to begin with a verb, e.g., “displaying a skeleton model [, is displayed]”

Claims 1, 2-4, 7, 8, 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Berend, *et al.*, (U.S. Patent No. 5,692,117) (hereinafter “Berend”).

Amended claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “displaying an input outline trace on the display device formed using an image input device” The cited section of Berend (COL. 35, lines 28-38; FIG. 38) disclose “the shape of a complex ... figure Represented ... [by] a series of armatures (shown as solid lines) joined at joints ... surrounded by a three dimensional envelope (shown in outline, as dashed lines)” Berend at COL. 35, lines 38-42 further states “we provide data defining the envelope by providing data defining one or more envelope components for each bone (typically one component of the envelope per ... armature). Referring to FIGS. 39a and 39b, each envelope component is represented by data defining one or more cross sections” Accordingly, Berend does not disclose, *inter alia*, “displaying an input outline trace on the display device formed using an image input device” as Berend’s envelope data is supplied from stored data, not “formed using an image input device ...” Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over Berend.

Claims 4-6, 9-11 and new claims 15-23 depend from claim 1, thus are allowable along with claim 1, and for other reasons. For example, new claim 15 recites, *inter alia*, “[t]he display object generation program according to claim 1, wherein said input outline trace comprises at least one movement trace formed using said image input device.” There is no disclosure in the sections of Berend cited by the Office Action of “at least one movement trace formed using said image input device.” Accordingly, claims 4-6, 9-11 and new claims 15-23 are allowable over Berend.

Claims 12, 13 and 14 all stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for the same rationale provided in the Office Action for claim 1. (Office Action, p. 3). Claims 12, 13 and 14 recites, *inter alia*, “displaying an input outline trace on the display device formed using an image input device” As explained above, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Berend of, *inter alia*, “displaying an input outline trace on the display device formed using an image input device” Accordingly, claims 12-14 are allowable over Berend.

Claims 15-34 have been added and are allowable over Berend. For example, claims 15-23 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1. As indicated above, claim 1 is allowable over Berend. Claim 24 recites, *inter alia*, “a processing sequence for displaying

an input outline trace on the display device formed based on at least another user input from an image input device” As discussed above, Berend does not teach or suggest a “displaying an input outline trace on the display device formed based on at least another user input from an image input device” Accordingly, claim 24 is allowable over Berend. Claims 25-34 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 24, thus are allowable along with claim 24, and for other reasons.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: April 5, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No.: 28,371

Christopher A. Monsey

Registration No.: 53,342

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorneys for Applicant